spent each year on the restoration of tanks only?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Notice.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHY ACHAR.—The information asked for in sub-section (*d*) relates to the amount spent for restoration of tanks only. But the answer furnishes the total of two items, *viz.*, restoration of old tanks as well as construction of new ones.

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—There would have been no objection to separate figures being furnished if there was sufficient time.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—What is the amount required for restoring all the 16,000 tanks?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is not possible to say that.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA.—Is it not possible to provide funds separately for the restoration of major tanks and for the restoration of minor tanks?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is being done. For minor tank restoration alone, a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs is provided. The provision was originally 1·25 lakhs but it was subsequently raised to Rs. 2 lakhs.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER.—From the figures furnished in a recent Government Notification, it is found that the average cost of restoring a minor tank will be, on an average, about Rs. 1,900. Is that figure inclusive of contribution also or does it represent the Government's share of the cost only?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is exclusive of contribution amount to be paid by the raiyats.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER.—If so, what will be the cost to Government?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It depends on the estimated cost of each work.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER.—Taking the total cost of each tank at Rs. 2,000 in round figures, it requires about Rs. 32 lakhs or Rs. 33 lakhs for restoring all the tanks in the State. Cannot the Government prepare a programme, provide this amount somehow and see that all the tanks are restored in the course of 4 or 5 years?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Government are anxious to restore all minor tanks as early as possible and a triennial programme has been prepared.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—It is because the tanks have not been restored that Government have been put to the necessity of sanctioning remissions year after year. If the Government restore all the tanks, they can save all the loss which they are incurring every year in the shape of remissions. From the point of view of Government revenues themselves, is it not advisable to restore all the tanks without delay?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—Yes, but to some extent remissions are inevitable. Besides, the proposal to restore all the tanks would involve a total expenditure of something like Rs. 40 lakhs.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA.—Why not Government formulate a ten-year programme and provide a sum of Rs. 4 lakhs every year and see that the entire work is completed within a period of 10 years from now?

Mr. N. N. AYYANGAR.—It is possible, but not practicable. I might however say that Government are fully alive to the importance of the restoration of minor tanks, and have been providing increased grants year after year for the purpose.

GENERAL RESOLUTIONS.

Resolution No. 1.

Prevention of Beggary.

Patel VEERE GOWDA moved the following resolution :—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that an Act may be passed to put an end to the nuisance of able-bodied persons resorting to beggary and that arrangements be made to train them up as artizans so that they might eke out their livelihood without nuisance to the public."

He stated that the number of able-bodied beggars was increasing from day to day and shop-keepers and house-owners were finding it a regular nuisance. At the same time, those who really deserved help were not getting help. Secondly, under the pretext of begging, several people were creating for themselves plenty of scope for committing thefts. Thirdly, a large number

of able-bodied men, having taken to beggary, had become idlers. He therefore suggested that begging by able-bodied persons be prevented by legislation and that such persons be trained in artizan courses so that they might eke out their livelihood.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA seconded the resolution. He said that he had brought up a similar resolution five or six years earlier, but that, for some reason, it did not come up for discussion at all. He represented that in Bangalore City particularly, the problem was assuming serious proportions. Beggars called at every door from morning till noon and in very large numbers. Also in bus-stands, at shops, and everywhere else, people were being surrounded by any number of beggars. Quite a large number of able-bodied persons also had made this a regular profession. The main point of complaint was that while charitably-disposed individuals with ready money at their disposal could get rid of the nuisance by giving away something, people who had no change and therefore could give nothing got abuses at the hands of the beggars. It was therefore necessary to introduce legislation to prevent beggary, particularly by able-bodied persons, providing at the same time for exemptions in favour of really deserving people. If this was done, the public would be saved a lot of nuisance. and the able-bodied beggars would be forced to work if they wanted to earn a living.

Mr. R. GOPALASWAMI IYER said that there were two kinds of people, *viz.*, the unemployed and the unemployable. There was some excuse for the latter to take to begging, but there was no effective means of preventing the former from doing so. He knew many instances of people who were not anxious to work and earn their livelihood in an honourable way, but who preferred to earn by begging. He also instanced the case of a young boy who was for some years confined in the Central Jail and had received training in carpentry during that time. After the boy was released, the speaker tried to get him employed in a factory on a daily wage of one rupee, but the boy told him that he (the speaker) would not get a good name for recommending him since the employer would find no use for the boy. The boy also argued that a number of people were committing thefts and not all of them were going to jail, that at the rate of one rupee per day, he would earn only about Rs. 365 a year, but that by stealing there was a chance of his earning thousands of rupees within a few days or minutes. Such being the case. the boy asked why he should accept a small job and toil from morning till night and live a miserable existence. The speaker explained that there were several people with that kind of mentality—people who were able to work but who had no inclination to work. For this reason, he said that it was necessary to introduce legislation to prevent able-bodied people from begging. But in this connection, it was necessary to remember that even in western countries the practice of late had been to commit to jail only such persons as could realize that they had committed a criminal act. The abnormal: the sub-normal and the delinquent people who were mentally weak, people with no one to guide them on right lines—such men were not jailed at all. Nor were they being sent to mental hospitals. Orphanages were considered to be the best places for all such men. The speaker went on to observe that one of the main causes for criminal tendencies on the part of young boys was that they as children had no proper guidance. If at least the Government provided that guidance, not only would there be less chances of the young boys developing criminal tendencies in their later life, but the tax-payer's burden also would be lightened. Coming nearer home, the Bombay and the Madras Governments were following a rule that uncared for children should be brought together and given training in useful avocations. Such a course might with advantage be adopted in Mysore also. But in order to examine what changes might be adopted to suit local conditions, he suggested that the Government might appoint a committee and that the proposed legislation might be taken up

after the report of that committee was received.

Mr. A. VENKATESIAH suggested that before seeking to prevent beggary, a vagrancy survey should be conducted. This was essentially a municipal problem, and a problem of immediate importance to the cities ,and should therefore be undertaken by the concerned municipalities. Such a survey was conducted by University students in Mysore City during the previous year and statistics had been collected. The survey disclosed the fact that many able-bodied people came under the vagrancy list. Nearly 30 per cent of them refused to give up beggary as they were quite happy and contented with their lot. But the fact remained that they did not deserve any charity or help from the general public.

Secondly, many of the beggars were suffering from contagious diseases and there was the danger of such people spreading the diseases wherever they went. During the Dasara and the Birthday seasons, Mysore City was attracting such beggars in large numbers, but the municipality could not prevent it for want of legislation. He therefore suggested that Government should conduct a vagrancy survey, collect statistics and then introduce suitable legislation.

The PRESIDENT enquired whether the Bangalore City Municipality was not contemplating some action in this direction.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA replied that whatever action that city municipal council might be proposing to take, it would lead to no tangible results for the reason that there was no legislation to enable the municipality to enforce its proposals. If therefore a legislation was enacted, the Bangalore City Municipal Council would take some effective action.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER said that a large number of beggars were steadily pouring into the State from other provinces of India and that for effectively preventing it, legislation should be passed very urgently.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha B. T. Kesavaiengar) said that this question had come up before this Assembly more than once in the past. One such occasion was in 1913 when certain practical difficulties in the way of preventing beggary were brought to notice. One of such difficulties was that public opinion was not in favour of legislation. Three points were mentioned in that connection, *viz.*,—

(*a*) that among certain communities, begging was a birth-right and any preventive action taken by the Government would offend the religious susceptibilities of such communities;

(*b*) that if legislation to prevent beggary was passed, some occupation would have to be found for those who would be deprived of a living, and for doing that, liberal grants would have to be provided;

(*c*) that the district boards and other local bodies would have to contribute towards the said expenditure; that Government could not take any effective action though they were prepared to do so, unless the local bodies discussed the question and submitted definite proposals.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, said that the Bangalore City Municipality was prepared to bear its share of the contribution.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR said that it might be so, but there were other local bodies which could not find funds for performing even their primary duties and as such it was not likely that they would be able to provide funds for optional duties of the kind under reference. However, on those occasions, neither the Government nor the local bodies found it possible to find funds for this purpose and so the question was not pursued further.

Again in 1926, when Mr. Byanna moved a resolution on this very subject, Government had stated that for certain reasons, it was not considered possible to take any action in the matter.

Continuing, the speaker said that even at present there was provision in the existing Police Act to prevent beggars from soliciting charity by exhibiting the diseased parts of their body near market places or other important public places.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA suggested that the Government might once again enquire of the local bodies as to which of them were agreeable to fall in if necessary legislative action was proposed Under that legislation, the police could prevent the vexation caused to the general public by beggars But so long as avenues of employment could not be found and the funds required therefor were not forthcoming, no action which Government might take would prove effective and fruitful.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR thought that conditions were not favourable for the introduction of any legislation throughout the State, but that particular municipal bodies like Bangalore City Municipal Council might take action in respect of prevention of beggary as an optional duty.

Messrs. B. L. BYANNA and A. VENKATESIAH requested that some special action might be taken at least in the cities.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR said that once a law was enacted, it would have to be made applicable to the entire State and also enforced rigorously.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY thought that there was no place for such legislation in a country like India.

Mr. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA however thought that effective action had become necessary because of the nuisance caused to the public by a large number of able-bodied beggars.

The PRESIDENT replied that Government would consider what action could be taken in the matter.

In view of this reply of Government, the resolution was not pressed.

Resolution No. 2.

Disqualifying Resigning Members for Re-election to Public Bodies.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER moved the following resolution :—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that it may be enacted that persons, elected or nominated as members to the Legislative Council, Representative Assembly and other local or Government bodies who resign, are disqualified to stand as candidates for election to the respective bodies for a period of three years."

Before speaking on the resolution proper, the mover traced the history of the origin and growth of the Representative Assembly up to the Proclamation of His Highness the Maharaja in 1923. He then stated that the present Assembly had been reconstituted on the basis of that Proclamation. In the earlier stages of the working of the Assembly, he said that all the members of the House were being nominated by the Deputy Commissioners, but later on the system of elections was substituted, a small number of seats being reserved for nominations. At the time of the last elections, the candidates had promised the voters that they would represent to the Government the grievances of the people and get them all the desired relief. Taking them at their word, the voters had returned certain candidates as members of the House. But instead of fulfilling their promise to the voters, many of them had since resigned their seats. In that way, they were guilty of a breach of faith with His Highness' subjects. Secondly, every General Election meant a very large expenditure of public money to Government. The voters also spent so much of their time and money in going to the booths for exercising their franchise. Taking all these things into consideration, the speaker calculated that the General Elections as well as the recent elections for filling up the vacancies caused by the resignation of so many members came to as high a figure as Rs. 2 to Rs. 3 lakhs. For having involved the State and its subjects in such a heavy expenditure, the members who had resigned could well be held responsible. Thirdly, such members had magnified small matters and created a wrong impression in the public mind about the acts and intentions of Government. They had thus proved themselves disloyal to the State as well as to His Highness because they had taken the Oath of Allegiance before they entered upon their duties as members of the Assembly. As many as 5 members of the Legislative Council, 70 of the Representative Assembly,

150 of the Municipalities and about 70 of the District Boards had resigned their membership in the course of a short period and caused a lot of dislocation of public business. Under the benign rule of His Highness the Maharaja there was no reason for them to have adopted such a revolutionary course. For drinking water wells, educational progress, tank works, industrial undertakings, etc., and in fact for all activities calculated to help the advancement and happiness of the subjects of the State, particular attention was being given by his Highness' Government. The Dewan and other officers of Government were patiently hearing representations from the subjects and affording relief to the extent possible. He could say without fear of contradiction that of all the 564 States in India, the administration of the Mysore State was acknowledged to be the most enlightened and benevolent. The fact that under such circumstances certain members had chosen to resign their membership only indicated their sinister motive of besmirching the fair name of the State and lowering it in the eyes of the outside world. It was necessary to prevent such people from getting into the constitutional assemblies of the State whenever it suited their purpose and getting out of them on some pretext or other. Again, with the impending constitutional reforms, it was likely that non-official members would have chances of becoming ministers and Government must see to it that such opportunities were not thrown open to the members who had now exposed themselves to the charges explained earlier by the speaker. To entrust large powers in the hands of such persons would be endangering the interests of the subjects of His Highness the Maharaja. Personally he felt that such persons were quite unfit to be members of the constitutional bodies at all. It was therefore desirable that the persons, who had resigned from constitutional bodies at present, should be prevented by means of legislation from standing for election at least for a period of three years.

With this object in view, he commended the resolution for the acceptance of the House.

Messrs. BHAKTAR SAHIB, H. K. MADIAH, Yejaman N. Y. VEERABHADRACHAR, HAJI N. DOWLAT KHAN SAHIB and others seconded the resolution.

AMENDMENT.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA said that he would also support the resolution provided the mover agreed to the insertion of the words "for other than *bona fide* reasons," after the word "resign" in line 6.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA seconded the amendment.

The PRESIDENT enquired how far the exact reason for resignation could be understood by third parties.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA stated that resignations may be due to personal reasons, sickness, etc., and that for such reasons any member ought to be free to resign without any restriction such as was proposed in the resolution.

The PRESIDENT replied that in such cases the disqualification need not apply.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER, however, said that he could not agree to the amendment. He observed that any member who was loyal to His Highness the Maharaja and to the electorate would not think of resigning his membership even if there was some personal inconvenience. He instanced the case of Mr. Hosakoppa Krishna Rao who was seriously ill and yet was good enough to attend the session. He could never agree that any member should be free to resign his membership at his own sweet will and pleasure with a view to participating in subversive activities.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA stated that in urging for disqualifying such persons, Mr. Muniswami Iyer could count upon the support of every member of the House. But he was only speaking of persons who, for genuine reasons, found themselves unable to continue as members of public bodies. If the Government were to accept a resolution seeking to disqualify every resigning member from becoming a member again

for a stated period, he feared that Government would be making themselves liable to severe blame.

Mr. ABDUL RASOOL SAB remarked that the persons who had now resigned were wrong in having done so without consulting their voters beforehand.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA retorted that the voters themselves had not protested against the action of such persons immediately after they had resigned. He inferred from this that they had acquiesced in the action of the members concerned. But that was a different matter. All that he wanted to urge on the present occasion was that if a member resigned for valid reasons, he should not be disqualified to stand for election at any time subsequently. He therefore requested the mover to accept his amendment.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH observed that the Assembly should deal with questions like this with sufficient wisdom and foresight. The reputation which the Houses of Legislature in Mysore enjoyed was indeed very high and the Assembly ought not to vote upon the present resolution in a hurry. The public bodies consisted of two classes of non-official members, namely, elected members and nominated members. In the case of elected members he felt that they should be free to resign whenever they wanted. If a particular member did not care to continue, his seat could easily be filled up in a bye-election. There was really no necessity for preventing such member from resigning. In the case of nominated members, however, he would suggest that such members need not be nominated again if once they resigned. He thought an understanding like this would be quite sufficient and that the mover need not press for the acceptance of the resolution under discussion.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB stated that the amendment might be put to vote before further discussion on the resolution was allowed.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA said that he had something more to say about the amendment in case it was going to be put to vote at that stage. He had not completed his argument because he had expected the mover to accept the amendment. Since that was not to be, he liked to add, that the Government would, by accepting the resolution under discussion, be interfering with the exercise of ordinary rights of citizenship, namely, the right to stand for election and to resign. He would also appeal to the mover of the resolution to remember that at any time in future he might himself like to resign for reasons of his own. But by pressing the resolution under discussion, he would be denying himself that freedom.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB stated that some sort of control in the matter was desirable and that there would be no justification for all the expenditure which would be necessitated by a number of bye-elections. The Government should save such expenditure and spend money on more useful purposes. The general tax-payer's money should not be wasted on bye-elections. And so he suggested that the resolution might be accepted with the addition of a proviso as follows:

"Government may however raise this disqualification in proper cases on applications made."

Mr. S. C. BELURIAH was not in favour of the resolution at all. He said that members lending support to the resolution might themselves regret it in future. He thought that Government might be left free to take such action as they deemed necessary in the case of all resignations.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER said that he would agree to the resolution being amended so as to permit of exemptions in the case of persons who wanted to resign their seats either on grounds of ill-health or of long absence from the State.

Mr. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA and **Mr. BALE GOWDA** agreed in this view.

Rao Sahib M. RAMASWAMY considered that while Government ought to be free to grant exemptions or not, it need not be necessary for the persons once resigning and subsequently seeking re election to make a formal application to Government praying for exemption.

Mr. G. MALLANNA thought that formal exemption was very necessary.

Messrs. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO and TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN said that the amendment of Mr. Khaji Syed Yusuff Sahib was very vague and it was not possible to understand all that was meant by the expression "in proper cases."

Mr. B. L. BYANNA however preferred this amendment and was content with leaving the expression "in proper cases" to be interpreted by the authorities. It was clear that the exemptions to be granted would relate only to cases in which the resignation was due to personal inconvenience or to illness or to continued absence from the State. Besides, the discussions now going on would be on record, and the spirit of these discussions would naturally be borne in mind by the Government in passing orders as and when such requests came up before them.

The PRESIDENT enquired who, according to the mover of the amendment, should have the discretion to decide whether the resignation in any particular case was for valid reasons or not.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA replied that Government should certainly have the discretion.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER stated that if that was the intention, he would certainly accept the amendment.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO said that he could not agree either to the resolution or to the amendment. He feared that if Government were to be free to decide whether in a particular case the resignation was for valid or invalid reasons, members of the concerned public bodies would oftentimes be at the mercy of the officers concerned. In other words, public bodies would consist merely of a set of flatterers.

Messrs. G. MALLANNA, MEER MAHOMED SAB, TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN, BALE GOWDA, KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB, MEER MAHOMED HUSSAIN and others protested against the use of the unparliamentary expression "a set of flatterers" and said that the member should be called upon to withdraw the same.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO assured the House that he never meant insult to anybody and that all that he meant was that if such undefined powers were left in the hands of the authorities, members of public bodies might not be free to exercise their responsibilities without fear or favour.

The PRESIDENT said that this point might be dropped and that the discussion might proceed on the resolution as amended.

Mr. MARULAPPA suggested that the amended resolution, if passed, might apply only to resignations to be tendered in future.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH said that he had calculated that elections or bye-elections would cost in all about Rs. 3 lakhs and that if this had to take place frequently, it would be a sheer waste of the tax-payers' money, apart from the waste of valuable time of both the candidates concerned and the voters in general. To prevent this, the mover of the resolution had proposed a very salutary measure of disqualifying the persons, who by their resignations necessitated bye-elections. Secondly, at the time of election each candidate would make all sorts of promises of redressal of grievances of the general public. And the voters returned certain candidates in the hope that these men would fulfil their promises. In other words, it was a regular contract between voters and the candidates. Any candidate resigning his seat in the middle of a term could well be charged with failure to fulfil his contract. From this point of view also, the resolution deserved to be passed. Thirdly, soon after the election and at the time of taking their seats in the public bodies concerned, particularly the Houses of Legislature, the candidates took the oath of allegiance to His Highness the Maharaja, his heirs and successors. By their subsequent resignations such members were blameworthy for their want of loyalty to His Highness the Maharaja. For all these reasons he supported the resolution. He also added that nobody would have thought of a resolution of this type if a number of resignations had not been sent in on a trivial point of difference as regards the continuance

of a certain member on the Constitutional Reforms Committee.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER interjected that the present situation had arisen as a result of the continuance of Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya as a member of the Reforms Committee.

Mr. K. VENKATARAMIAH, proceeding, said that he was not very particular whether a certain member continued to serve on that committee or preferred to resign. After all, members of the committee were nominated by the Government and there was no electorate directly concerned with their continuance or otherwise on the committee. The point which he was unable to follow was that elected members of the public bodies had chosen to resign their membership and having taken that inadvisable step, they were also inducing other members of such bodies to follow their example. This latter action which they were taking, the speaker remarked, was very unfair. It had become a fashion with many to submit their resignations and he would even characterise it as an epidemic. Unless effective steps were taken to put an end to that state of affairs, there would be chaos in all public bodies. But for the good sense which the generality of the members of public bodies in the State had shown, such chaos should have overtaken the State as a whole already. Happily, however, most people knew that the members who had resigned had not acted properly, and so the public bodies were in a position to function satisfactorily. It was not difficult to imagine that the work of local bodies in matters like health and sanitation should have suffered if the members of such bodies had allowed themselves to be influenced by the dictates of certain persons. Such a situation should never have been allowed to develop in any well-governed State, and the best way of averting such situations in the future would be by taking legislative action as proposed. He therefore strongly supported the resolution.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA, who spoke next, stated by way of preface that he had not proposed to participate in the discussion of this resolution. In fact he had even hoped that the resolution would be discussed and disposed of in a somewhat light-hearted manner. But the fact that his own name had been mentioned by the mover of the resolution in connection with the present political situation in Mysore, had made it incumbent upon him to speak out his mind on the question.

The question whether the members of the Congress Party who had been appointed as members of the Reforms Committee should serve on the committee or not had been discussed in March and April 1938. The speaker himself was privileged to interview Mahatma Gandhi on that very question. Mahatma Gandhi compared the state of affairs in Mysore with that in other Indian States and exhorted the speaker as well as the Congress President Mr. T. Siddalingaiya who was also present with him then to co-operate with the Government in every possible way. With all the benefit of his personal knowledge of men and affairs in Mysore, Mahatmaji had repeatedly cautioned the congressites in Mysore to act with wisdom because, while in most of the States the Congress activities had been banned and even the mention of the name of the Congress was not tolerated, in Mysore His Highness the Maharaja and his Dewan had the wisdom and foresight to allow Congressmen to carry on their activities undisturbed, and in such a State the best thing for members of the Congress to do was to maintain harmonious relations with the administration and make themselves indispensable to the Government, so that the latter would in all cases be in a way compelled to consult the former on all matters of moment. In the result, Mahatmaji advised members of the Reforms Committee to co-operate with the Government and never to break off from them. Consistent with that advice, the speaker had decided to continue to serve on the committee.

Secondly, the Mysore Congress had played no part in the speaker's appointment as a member of the Reforms Committee. This point had been made amply clear in the course of answers to

supplementary questions put on a relavant question earlier during the present session of the Assembly. For this reason, the speaker was not obliged to follow the advice of certain of his friends, that he should cease to be a member of the committee.

Thirdly, in connection with an adjournment motion moved at the previous session of the Assembly, members of the Mysore Congress had given an undertaking to the Government that at all Congress functions, Mysore Flag would be hoisted and saluted first and then the National Flag. Subsequent to that session of the Assembly a special session of the Mysore Congress had been convened at Shivapura, and it became necessary for the speaker to move a resolution at that place to the effect that the Mysore Flag must be duly respected. The speaker was sorry to state that that resolution was not given the treatment it deserved and the speaker himself received scant courtesy at the hands of the delegates. Thereupon the speaker was determined to do everything he could to see that the honour of the Mysore Flag was maintained He then interviewed Mahatmaji who heard him and advised him and his friends on the question. The proposal then engaging the attention of some of the Congressites was whether Flag Satyagraha should be resorted to in Mysore, when Mahatmaji's advice was that that step should not be taken. The Government Order of 17th May contained the statement that all differences of opinion had disappeared when the Mysore Congress undertook to respect the Mysore Flag and yet some Congressmen had given occasion to considerable difference of opinion on that very question subsequently. Some of them had taken serious objection to the speaker having moved the resolution referred to already at Shivapura Congress. They then went up to the Head of the Administration and urged that the speaker should not be allowed to serve on the Reforms Committee any longer. But the Dewan was firm enough to tell them that he could not accept that suggestion for the reason that the speaker's appointment as a member of that committee was not the result of any recommendation from the Congress authorities. The Congressmen subsequently set a rumour afloat that their resignations from the several public bodies were on account of the alleged failure on the part of the Government to respect the terms of what was called the Patel-Mirza Agreement. The member then referred to a document of February 1925 in which Sirdar Patel had written to say that the question at issue was not whether the Administration had committed any breach of the terms of that agreement or not, but whether members of the Mysore Congress had acted fairly and squarely in the unfortunate situation which had been created by their resignations. He then asked why he should have been asked to resign his membership on the Reforms Committee or the Representative Assembly when the question involved was purely one between himself and the Mysore Congress. Whether such insistence on the part of the Congress members was justified or not, the only question now for consideration was whether members who resigned their seats on the public bodies need be prevented at all from standing for election subsequently. The resolution under discussion proposed that such members should be disqualified to stand for election for a term of three years. This proposal was one which called for the most serious consideration at the hands of the Assembly. Public opinion in the State as expressed by the local newspapers and also the resolutions of the Mysore Congress Committee which held a session at Viduraswatha only recently, was to the effect that the Congress should not non-co-operate with the Government or needlessly aggravate the situation, but should maintain harmonious relations with the Government and secure such relief as was possible for the raiyats in various directions. Congressmen who were parties to the resolution at Viduraswatha could not in conscience subscribe to an attitude of alienating the sympathies of the Government unnecessarily. What was more, by resigning in large numbers their membership on public bodies and in inducing others also to

follow their example, they were obviously acting against their own resolution and inviting deterrent action on the part of the Government. According to the advice of Mahatmaji and Sirdar Patel, the duty of Congressmen was always to keep the door open for negotiations and agreement Having said this, he would also appeal to the Government and to the public bodies in the State not to be vindictive but to continue their present attitude. In particular, he appealed to the mover of the resolution under discussion to take up a conciliatory attitude, not to mind things which had already happened but to assist in the re-establishment of good understanding between the Congressmen and the Government. It was the one wish of all the members of the House that such understanding might yet be established and members of the Congress enabled to do all they could in this direction, so that all those interested in the welfare of the State could unite and work towards the attainment of the goal of Responsible Government under the ægis of His Highness the Maharaja. In this view he appealed to the mover to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. V. VENKATASAMY CHETTY compared the position of the Government to that of a parent and remarked that even though Congressmen might not have maintained proper relations with the Government, the Government for their part should not be vengeful in their attitude towards Congressmen. He hoped that the differences now existing between them would soon disappear and Congressmen would at no distant date find themselves in a position to work for the future good of the State, maintaining at the same time cordial relations with the Government. In this view, he suggested that it was not necessary to disqualify members who once resigned their seats on the public bodies in the State to seek re-election even during the same term of office.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB observed that if a child was persisting in disobedience, its own parent would think of punishing it. It was in this sense that the resolution proposed the disqualification of resigning members to seek re-election for a certain period of time. He was in favour of the resolution particularly in view of the amendment which had been accepted by the mover himself to the effect that in all suitable cases Government might lift the disqualification in question. He would also look at the question under discussion from the general tax-payers' point of view. He appreciated the argument advanced by one of the earlier speakers that members who resigned their seats in the midst of a term would not be discharging their duties by the electors. Members of constitutional assemblies were representatives of the general tax-payer. By resigning their seats, they would be sacrificing the interests of the tax-payer and allowing the case of the latter to go by default. From this point of view, as well as with the object of preventing waste of public money, which would be involved in bye-elections, he thought that there would be nothing wrong in the House passing the resolution.

He therefore requested the House to pass the resolution unanimously.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO brought to notice that 95 per cent of the Congressmen who had resigned their seats on different public bodies had done so as a result of undue influence or compulsion. In a few cases there was regular coercion. The persons who were compelling others to resign were hoping that if they induced a large number of members on the several public bodies to resign and if re-elections were held, they could be sure of coming out successful in the elections and thus demonstrate that they were commanding lot of influence and power, and could probably also rise to important positions in course of time. The speaker had just read from the papers that certain persons had issued circulars calling upon members who had not already resigned their seats to do so at least now and to offer apology for not having resigned earlier. This, he said, was a very unfair thing to do. Personally he felt that the persons from whom a public apology was due were, not those

who had not resigned their seats but those who had resigned their seats and uttered several disloyal statements. If the present position was allowed to continue, the interests of loyal subjects would be endangered and the Government would be perfectly justified in taking severe action against the persons responsible for such a state of affairs. In spite of all these, the speaker appealed to the mover not to press his resolution and to the Government to take a lenient view of the present situation.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA was of opinion that the reasons for accepting a resolution like the one under discussion were stronger than those for rejecting it. Still, he would appeal to Government not to accept it and to the mover not to press it. If the Government of Mysore enjoyed a high reputation, it was to a very large extent due to a policy of forgive and forget which they adopted in all cases of differences of opinion between themselves and public workers. Whatever the attitude of public workers on particular questions might be, there was no doubt that every Mysorean was anxious to serve the State to the best of his ability. But by accepting this resolution, the Government would be preventing such workers to serve the State according to their best lights. Besides it would lead to further embitterment of feelings.

One of the earlier speakers had brought to notice that Mahatmaji's advice to Congressmen was to maintain harmonious relations with the Government. Similarly the speaker would also appeal to the Government to show generosity towards Congressmen. The speaker himself was a member of the Congress till recently and he knew for a fact that several Congressmen had realised that they were wrong in the attitude which they were pursuing towards Government at present. In fact they were also feeling very sorry for this. But having taken up a certain attitude for some time they thought that they could not go back at this stage. The best thing for the Government to do under such circumstances was to forgive such members and to keep the door open for them to once again co-operate with the Government as a result of the advice tendered by Mahatma Gandhi. The speaker therefore appealed to the mover not to press the resolution.

Mr. TIPPU SULTAN ALI KHAN said that he was tempted to fall in with the views expressed by Mr. Bhupalam R. Chandrasekharayya and Mr. S. Ramappa. But he was one of those who felt the need for proper discipline being maintained in all institutions. Mahatma Gandhi himself had deplored the lack of discipline in Congress ranks and was doing everything possible to purge the Congress of all undesirable elements. Similarly it was the duty of the Government also to see that in the interest of discipline such of the members as did not conform to recognized standards of public life should be kept out of public bodies. He did not believe that anybody would be right in characterising a resolution like this as actuated by a spirit of vengeance; nor was the resolution designed to be directed in its operation against Congressmen in particular. If once the resolution was passed, every member of every public institution would be liable to be brought under its operation. More than one member had already referred to the waste of public funds as a result of bye-elections necessitated by the resignation of particular members at any time during a triennium. It had been contended that a member of any public body ought to be free to resign whenever he liked. But nobody had any right to do anything involving waste of public funds. For these reasons he had great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

Mr. K. N. PUTTANNA said that the only object with which the mover had brought forward this resolution before the House was to ensure the future progress and the fair name of the State. It stood to reason that Government took strong action against persons who disturbed the even progress of affairs. One or two members had contended that denial of liberty to resign membership in any public body would amount to interference with the exercise of a fundamental right of the member concerned. As against that, he would

ask the House to consider whether any member would be entitled to sacrifice the interests of his own voters according to his own whims and fancies. It was to prevent this that the resolution under discussion had been moved. The Government could not be charged, if they accepted the resolution, with passing drastic and unnecessary laws, because the resolution had not come up for consideration a day too soon. Just as the Press Act had been enacted in view of actual dissemination of wrong and objectionable views by certain newspapers, the Government would be perfectly justified in passing the law under reference in view of the situation actually brought about by certain Congressmen in the State. He would have excused the Congressmen in Mysore if there was some little justification for the obstructive attitude which they adopted with regard to the Government of Mysore. Mahatma Gandhi himself had granted that Mysore occupied a very high place among Indian States and that it would be a sin to disturb the normal progress of the State without justifiable cause. So, the action of Congressmen in Mysore such as non-co-operating with the Government, resigning their seats on public bodies, inducing others to follow their example, etc., could never be justified. He therefore thought that a law such as the one now proposed was really called for in the present circumstances.

Mr. MISRILALL PARASMALL said that he was not in favour of the resolution since it would amount to a curtailment of the liberty of action of public workers.

Mr. JATHARE NAIK appealed to Government to view the action of Congressmen with indifference. It did not matter very much which particular party came in or went out of public bodies so long as there were men of discretion ready to take up places if rendered vacant by resignation of certain people. Just as the Representative Assembly was able to carry on with new members in place of the Congressmen who had resigned, other public bodies also would go on quite as smoothly even though particular individuals vacated their seats. In the interests of cordial relations amongst all parties, he would suggest that the resolution under discussion be not pressed.

Mr. S. C. BELURIAH also subscribed to this view.

Mr. ABDUL RASOOL SAB said that Mahatma Gandhi was perfectly justified in comparing Mysore to Ramarajya. The speaker would go a step further and liken His Highness the Maharaja to Dharmaraya. In a State administered by such a saintly Ruler, members resigning their seats on public bodies in large numbers would only bring discredit to the Government of the State. He was therefore in favour of the disciplinary action being taken against such members.

Mr. K. MUNIVENKATAPPA, in supporting the resolution, said that not only was it necessary to disqualify the persons who had now resigned from standing for election for another 3 years but it would be also desirable not to place wide powers in the hands of such persons even in future. He was afraid that the Reforms Committee which was now sitting might recommend the transference of real power to the hands of non-official members and that when persons of the kind under reference came to exercise such powers, the interests of minority communities might be endangered. He therefore prayed that Government might consider in connection with the present resolution the undesirability of placing wide powers in the hands of persons whose *bona fides* might not be beyond question.

Mr. K. LAKSHMINARAYANA RAO said that disqualifications such as those under discussion had never been enforced in any provincial administration in India or in any outside country having a democratic form of Government. If the Government of Mysore was really in favour of encouraging national consciousness, it should not cut at the very root of the principle of democracy by accepting a resolution like the one under discussion. It might be that a particular action taken by Congressmen in Mysore did not find favour with the

general public. But it would be too much for any one to characterise their motive as sinister. After all, all Congressmen were not statesmen and might commit mistakes. But it should be open for them to correct themselves. By passing this resolution, the Assembly would be denying such a chance to them. He therefore requested the mover to withdraw the resolution and the Government not to accept it even if it was passed.

Mr. SYED MOHIYUDDIN HUSSAIN said that his attitude towards Congressmen in Mysore was one of absolute indifference. He had nothing to say either in favour or against them in general. But so far as their part in the Assembly was concerned, he was sorry to have to say that it was not such as to do them credit. He remembered that on one occasion they all staged a walk-out, and on the present occasion they had not only resigned in very large numbers but were also inducing other members to follow suit. It looked to him as though they had resigned in the sure hope that others would not be forthcoming to take up their places. But, unfortunately for them, men of wisdom were available to take their places, so that the Assembly had not been stranded as expected by them. But the question for consideration was how long the Government should tolerate such actions on the part of the members concerned. At the same time he also realized that the resolution under discussion, if passed, would not apply only to Congressmen. If, for example, a number of Muslim members of the House resigned, the proposed law would apply to them as well. In this view it could not be said that even if the resolution was adopted and a law as proposed enacted, Government were actuated by a spirit of *vendetta*. The legislation proposed was necessary and he had therefore great pleasure in supporting the resolution.

The SECOND MEMBER (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman) said on behalf of the Government that the resolution had been discussed at sufficient length and that it was possible to argue the point in both ways. The view of the Government on the question under discussion was that the rules at present in force might well be followed for some time to come and that any disciplinary measures such as that proposed could be resorted to if circumstances really necessitated them. For the present, however, he hoped that the mover would not press the resolution.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER, in replying to the debate, observed that he was not a believer in unrestricted liberty being conceded to anybody and everybody without reference to individual merits. Even in the case of members of public bodies, they were expected to exercise their rights and privileges in the interests of the State as a whole and they had no right to disturb the even progress of the State.

Secondly, speaking of the action of Congressmen in Mysore, he expressed the opinion that those who had made promises of various kinds to the voters at the time of the general elections were guilty of a breach of those promises by their resignations. Persons who were never tired of referring to agreements ought to learn how to respect their own promises and undertakings.

One or two members had referred to the so-called Patel-Mirza Pact. He did not know how far such a term could be adopted in the present case, because any agreement would be worthy of that name only if entered into by parties of equal status and position. In the case of any understanding that might have been arrived at between Sirdar Patel and Sir Mirza Ismail, the best name that could be given to it would be a 'suggestion,' and even granting that there was such an understanding with regard to the present action of the Congressmen in Mysore, he was definitely of opinion that the persons who had resigned ought not to be free to re-enter public bodies.

Thirdly, he would bring to the notice of the Government that Congressmen who had made an open promise of duly respecting the Mysore Flag at Congress functions were not acting according to that promise. He was aware of such an instance which occurred recently in

Kolar District. He often felt sorry that Congressmen were making it appear as though there were two Rulers in Mysore

There were many irregularities and defects for which Congressmen in Mysore were responsible and the speaker was thankful to Mr. Bhupalam Chandrasekharayya for having exposed some of them. Mr. Chandrasekharayya had expressed an apprehension that if this resolution was passed, Congressmen would be tempted to resort to certain objectionable activities. But the speaker would ask whether Congressmen were not known for such activities even when resolutions like this were not passed. For example, they had resigned in large numbers and attempted to dislocate the business of public bodies. They had persuaded other members also to resign. They did some other objectionable things and consequently went to jail. In some other States, Congressmen in Travancore, for example, had set fire to motor-cars, attacked the central jail and killed the warder. In another State, the Political Agent was killed and the convicts in a jail were let off. All these incidents went to show that many a Congressman had no respect for authority, and so there was no guarantee that even if the resolution under discussion was not passed, Congressmen would be peaceful citizens. If therefore they really resorted to objectionable programmes, the Government who were strong enough must deal with them suitably.

The speaker also thanked another member, Mr. B. Srinivasa Rao, for having brought to light that many of the Congressmen who had resigned their seats had done so not as a result of their own judgment but on account of the instigation of others. All that he could say with regard to the members who had resigned simply because they were instigated by others to do so was that such members were fit to be not in constitutional assemblies in the State but elsewhere. All things considered, he was sorry that he could not withdraw the resolution. He therefore requested the President to put the same to vote.

The resolution was put to vote and declared lost, 35 voting for and 50 against.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER observed that he did not mind the result of the vote. He invited the attention of the Government to Rule 6 of the Representative Assembly Act, XVIII of 1923, under which Government could make rules from time to time, and appealed to them to take action under that rule to effectively deal with wholesale resignations submitted by a body by members during the course of a triennium.

Resolution No. 3.

Introduction of Criminal Law Amendment Act.

Mr. R. P. RAJANNA moved :—

"That this Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that the Criminal Law Amendment Act as in force in other parts of India may also be introduced in the Mysore State in the interests of public peace."

In doing so, he observed that the enactment of the Criminal Law Amendment Act in Mysore, as in British India, had been suggested by the Ramesam Committee and that if the suggestion was not adopted by the Government, matters would go very hard with the peace-loving residents of Goribidnur Taluk particularly, who might be forced to leave the taluk for good. The speaker had the misfortune to take up the contract for an excise shop at Ramapur but on account of picketing and other measures adopted by Congressmen that shop had to be kept closed for the preceding 11 months. No doubt, when higher officers of Government happened to visit the areas in which the excise shops were located, Congressmen would talk nicely and reasonably; but the moment the officers turned their backs, they would take to violence and make it impossible for anybody to approach the shops. He therefore thought that legislation as proposed was absolutely necessary.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER seconded the resolution.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSEIN supported it.

Mr. KHAJI SYED YUSUFF SAHIB hoped that the members of the House would support the resolution. The speaker said that he no doubt subscribed to the principle of prohibition, but he was definitely against coercion of any kind. He was in a position to state that there was corruption in the methods adopted by Congressmen who were working for prohibition. They were allowing contractors to carry on their business provided they paid some subscription to the Congress. But they gave trouble of every conceivable kind to those who would not join the Congress and subscribe for it. For having refused to join the Congress or sympathise with it, even the most influential gentlemen in the taluk were not in a position to keep their shops open. Similar things were happening in Madhugiri Taluk also. Even apart from their behaviour towards the contractors of excise shops, Congressmen were doing other objectionable acts. For example, in all their speeches they vilified the Government and made all sorts of false allegations against those in authority. They set up people to acts of violence. Even the most benevolent measures initiated by the Government were being interpreted to the credulous public in the most uncharitable manner. The burden of their song was that the tax-payers' money was being wasted on purely spectacular objects. They were promoting class hatred and bringing the Administration into contempt. All these were activities which ought not to be allowed any longer. Even in British Indian provinces, Congressmen were formerly saying that the ordinary law of the land was adequate to deal with offences of all kinds and that the Criminal Law Amendment Act was altogether unnecessary. But the moment Congressmen came to power they began to say that the Criminal Law Amendment Act was very necessary and as a matter of fact they had made use of it in a number of cases In these circumstances, he supported the resolution.

Mr. L. VEMA REDDY also was of opinion that an Act as proposed was very necessary in the present circumstances of the State, not merely as a matter of convenience to Government but also in the interests of the welfare of the people of the State. As stated already, Mysore was not going to be the only State in which such a law would be in force. It was already in force in British Indian provinces. The very persons who were protesting against it formerly were now making use of it. There could be no objection therefore to enacting—at any rate there could be no harm—in enacting such a law in Mysore. It might be that in course of time a situation might develop when resort to a piece of special legislation of the kind under consideration would become necessary. The Government could not think of enacting a law when such a situation actually developed. As a measure of prudence, therefore, he thought that the Government would do well to enact a law as proposed.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA observed that neither the mover nor his supporters had shown sufficient grounds for the enactment of the Criminal Law Amendment Act in Mysore. All that they had said was that some people were giving trouble to excise contractors in certain places and that therefore the proposed legislation should be enacted. It might be that the Ramesam Committee had suggested the enactment of such a law in Mysore. But the House must remember that that suggestion had not been made by a majority of the members of that committee. Only one member had suggested it. Besides, the Government had not passed orders as yet on the Ramesam Committee Report and the speaker did not know how far action was likely to be taken on the particular suggestion contained in the report especially when that suggestion came from a single member of the committee. The mere fact that the Congress Ministries in certain provinces were making use of the Criminal Law Amendment Act which was already on the Statute Book would not justify the enactment of a similar law in Mysore. The Legislature in Mysore ought to exercise its discretion and see whether a law of that

kind was really called for in the State. Personally he was of opinion that there was no need for such a law in Mysore. Situations of various kinds had developed in the past, but the Government had been able to deal with them adequately with the help of the laws already existing. Surely, the Government could not put down agitation of any kind by enacting legislation of this nature. If at all, the agitation might get worse and assume serious proportions.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA, however, was of opinion that the Criminal Law Amendment Act was not necessary for Mysore. Public opinion in all the provinces was in favour of the effective separation of functions as between the judiciary and the executive, and if such a law was really enacted, persons at the helm of affairs might, in particular situations, make the fullest use thereof. If ever such a thing happened, he was afraid the reputation of Mysore would surely suffer.

It was true that Congress Ministries in certain provinces were making use of the Criminal Law Amendment Act to which they were originally definitely opposed. On this account, a large number of responsible men in those provinces were of the opinion that the Ministers referred to might not have any chance of being returned in the future elections. In Mysore, however, Government had been able to deal with any situation and an efficient administration like the present did not need any special law like the Criminal Law Amendment Act.

The mover had stated that unless the Act was passed, as proposed, peaceful citizens of Goribidnur would have to think of leaving that taluk. But the House would have welcomed it if the mover had also brought to notice whether similar situations had arisen in more than one place. From the solitary example of Ramapur village which he had quoted, Government might not be well-advised in enacting a special law designed to be in force in all parts of the State. Even as regards Goribidnur Taluk, the speaker certainly did not believe that any great calamity had overtaken it. Nor was he aware of any situation which had really developed in that taluk and which could not be dealt with under the ordinary law of the land. Granting that instances had occurred such as were referred to by the mover, it should have been quite possible for the local officials to bring the offenders to book. It did not seem logical for people in Mysore to say that because a law was in force in Madras, the same law should be copied in Mysore also.

The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Rajasevaprasaktha B. T. Kesavaiengar) explained on behalf of the Government that the authorities had been able so far to deal with all situations under the existing laws of the land. For the present, therefore, Government had no intention of enacting the Criminal Law Amendment Act. If however circumstances warranted such a law being put on the Statute Book at any time in the future, Government would not hesitate to pass such a law.

Mr. R. P. RAJANNA said that for the edification of Mr. Byanna he could cite any number of instances in which grave situations had arisen in the villages which could not be suitably dealt with by local officers.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSEIN added that Congressmen were visiting villages along with certain women who were abusing officers of Government, raising all sorts of shouts and displaying flags, which were offensive to at least some of the citizens. People in Goribidnur Taluk often missed the hand of authority in the villages and he was afraid that unless some strong action was taken against the persons responsible for such abuse of law, they would have to vacate their homes and villages and migrate to other places in quest of peace.

Mr. BHAKTAR SAHIB brought to notice that in as many as 16 villages in the Madhugiri Taluk, not even one excise shop was allowed to carry on business. All casks and pots had been broken to pieces by those in charge of picketing. In the initial stages of picketing, they were getting into the shops, dragging out people and beating them. A number of complaints had been lodged about this and cases also

filed. But no relief was available to the excise contractors and for eleven months no shop was able to carry on business to any extent. In all the cases in which complaints were lodged before the local officers, the officers had confessed that they were unable to deal with the situation. He also brought to notice that the officers had not been able to give relief to poor people even when cattle belonging to them had been taken away by persons responsible for the agitation in the taluk and had them impounded in the cattle pounds.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR observed that cases of such serious nature had not been reported to Government and if ever such things had happened in the villages, Government hoped that the local officers would have made proper *bandobust* to deal with the persons responsible for the same.

Mr. ABDUL RASOOL SAB quoted a case in which for non-payment of land revenue in Maniyur village, Nagamangala Taluk, cattle had been distrained but the owners thereof had forcibly set them free.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR replied that all such cases could well be dealt with under the ordinary law of the land. But if, as already stated, any unfortunate situation arose in future, necessitating the enactment of a special law, Government would not hesitate to enact the same.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED HUSSEIN represented that neither the Amildars nor the Police Inspectors nor any other officers took notice of complaints made to them and that people were at a loss to know to whom they should apply for relief in certain circumstances.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR replied that specific cases might be brought to the notice of the authorities concerned so that they might consider whether they could not deal with the same under the provisions of the Indian Penal Code.

Mr. R. P. RAJANNA said that if only he agreed to join the Congress and to pay some subscription, he could open his shops even now and carry on trade on a large scale. But the trouble with him was that he had not yielded to pressure from Congressmen. For nine months he had been unable to go to the village in question except on one or two occasions when he had the company and support of the Excise Commissioner and the Deputy Commissioner. Subsequently, however, he had explained his plight to the Deputy Commissioner. And all that that officer could tell the speaker was to avoid going to the village altogether. The shop had been broken into and the doors and windows of the speaker's house also had been smashed. The vendor himself had been tied to a tree and beaten. In fact, few traces of the shop were left at present. Considering all this, the speaker requested the Government to afford adequate relief in this and other similar cases.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR enquired whether a regular case had been filed in connection with the instances under reference and regular investigation held.

Mr. R. P. RAJANNA replied that the cases could not proceed for want of witnesses for the complainant. Even to get witnesses, the speaker would have to join the Congress.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR asked whether it would be impossible to get even a few witnesses if the vendor, as alleged, was tied to a tree and beaten openly and whether there should not be at least a few reports of such cases of violence before Government thought of enacting a special law like the one under reference. Personally he felt that the local officers could certainly take action to deal with cases of the kind referred to, under Sections 39 of the Police Act and 107, 108 and 144 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Mr. R. P. RAJANNA then alleged that even the local police officers were winking at many of the things happening there. He then stated that when complaints of a serious nature were preferred before them, they would go to the spot and make inquiries. But all the people available locally would be Congressmen who would state before the police officers that there was no incident at all and that everything was normal. In fact, in the whole taluk, there were very few persons who

had not joined the Congress. That was the reason why things were made so hot for the speaker and a few others. In these circumstances, he appealed to the Government either to enact the law proposed or to assure the few non-Congressmen in the taluk of perfect safety and also give to such men sufficient compensation for all the loss and trouble underwent by them.

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR replied that the Government could not enact a special drastic law as proposed unless it was clear to them that the ordinary law already in force was not adequate for the purpose of dealing with the situations actually arising. As regards the statement made by Mr. Rajanna that the Deputy Commissioner had asked him to avoid going to the village altogether, the speaker said that if that was so, the Deputy Commissioner had not advised Mr. Rajanna properly. Personally, however, he hoped that the Deputy Commissioner could not have tendered such advice. As District Magistrate, it was his duty to give Mr. Rajanna every assurance of safety.

The PRESIDENT said that Mr. Rajanna, or for the matter of that, any loyal subject of the State need have nothing to fear from Congressmen or any other persons. Government would certainly deal with all situations as they developed.

Mr. Y. V. MUNISWAMI IYER remarked that because the Dewan was very sympathetic and patient in all circumstances, local officers had come to believe that they should be soft in dealing with all situations, however grave.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED SAHIB was also of the same opinion.

The PRESIDENT said that there was no reason for anybody to think so.

In the light of the above discussion, the resolution was not pressed.

Resolution No. 4.

Abolition of District Boards.

Mr. M. SIVABASAPPA moved the following resolution :—

"This Assembly recommends to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja that the existing District Boards be abolished and that Taluk Boards be established instead throughout the State."

In moving the above resolution, **Mr. SIVABASAPPA** set about examining the powers and responsibilities of the district boards, how far those powers and responsibilities were being discharged satisfactorily, whether the grants allotted to them annually by the Government for various activities were being utilised to the best advantage, and whether there was any necessity of keeping on the district boards, considering that they were now powerless to give effect to the intentions of Government in organizing them as autonomous bodies. From this point of view, he reviewed the progress under moral and material development in the districts and the part played by the district boards in directing the same. Taking the question of medical relief first, he pointed out that though the district boards were contributing funds towards it, they had no voice in the administration of medical relief, which was exclusively under the supervision and control of the District Medical Officers. These officers were direct subordinates of the Senior Surgeon who was not at all answerable to the district board for any acts of commission or omission on his part. It was found that the district boards could do no more than making suggestions as to the places where dispensaries should be opened and the places where extensions to such buildings were called for. This being so, he contended that nothing would be lost by abolishing the boards. He next took up the question of construction and maintenance of roads and explained that this also was in the hands of some other authority, *viz.*, the Engineering Department. The district boards were, no doubt, free to give suggestions in the matter but the Engineering Department was not bound to adopt them. It was the Public Works Department which investigated each scheme, prepared plans and estimates and also executed the works. The position of the district boards in this matter was that, whether their suggestions were accepted or not, they had simply to pay down their share of

the cost even before the work was taken up. They had no voice whatever in the execution of the works.

As regards primary education, though nominally it was under the control of the district boards, the boards had no controlling voice even to the extent to which school boards had. The powers of the district boards were confined to the abolition of languishing schools and opening schools in other villages instead, transferring teachers from one school to another, recommending building grants to schools, and the like. Every other power was in the hands of the departmental officers. No doubt the power of granting promotions and ordering dismissals was vested in the district boards, but their orders in those respects also were appealable.

In regard to drinking water wells, he explained that formerly the district boards used to get contributions from Government, and that with their own funds, supplemented by the contributions referred to, the district boards could provide wells in all deserving places. The work of constructing the wells was originally entrusted to the district board itself. But recently this procedure was revised and the Deputy Commissioner was collecting contributions from the district boards and entrusting the funds to a committee which would distribute them to the various places in such a manner as it thought fit. In other words, the district boards had no voice even in the matter of providing drinking water wells.

The speaker next referred to the question of sanitation and public health and said that till recently the district boards were responsible for supervising the work of sanitary inspectors including items like vaccination. But recently this responsibility also was sought to be transferred to another agency, *viz.*, the Department of Public Health, on the ground that the local bodies had no experience of that kind of work. Certain district boards had protested against this kind of curtailment of their powers and urged that they should be allowed to retain in their own hands at least this small vestige of power which they had been enjoying for long.

The member then mentioned that there were only one or two other matters in which district boards were still exercising independent powers, *viz.*, (1) the auctioning of shandi rights, and (2) control of travellers' bungalows and musafirkhanas. Barring these, he said, there were no other powers which these so-called autonomous bodies could exercise.

Proceeding, the member stated that the resolution suggested the revival of taluk boards in place of the district boards proposed to be abolished and that this suggestion was based on the following reasons: According to the constitution of the district board, each taluk was to be represented by 2 or 3 representatives. If the representatives of one taluk wanted a particular road to be laid out, representatives of other taluks would unite and defeat the proposition. The reason was that members without personal knowledge of the wants and grievances of all the taluks in the district could not appreciate questions relating to particular taluks. The result was that the entire allotment might be utilised for a few items and other works might not receive any attention at all. Besides, the sanctioned grants could not be equitably distributed over all taluks. The district boards as such could do very little for the different parts comprising them. If the taluk boards were revived and the different works entrusted to them, they could be depended upon for spending the money in a manner more beneficial to each taluk than at present. The jurisdiction of the taluk boards being small, the members could visit every hobli and ascertain its urgent needs and wishes in the matter of roads, drinking water wells, dispensaries, schools, etc. There was urgent need for maternity homes and midwives in the interior villages and these could be provided for at the rate at least of one for a group of villages. Similarly, central schools might be established at the rate of one for every group of villages. The taluk boards could pool together the resources of all the village panchayets, and add on the income derived from education cess, make their own contributions to the extent possible, and thus

provide buildings for school houses, quarters for school masters, etc. These, in his opinion, would tend to the expansion of primary education in each locality at least to some extent. For these reasons, he prayed for the abolition of district boards and the revival of taluk boards.

Before concluding, however, the member represented that till district boards were abolished and taluk boards constituted instead, the existing village panchayets should be specially helped to make substantial progress and that for this purpose, Government must make some regular and substantial grants for improvement of roads, etc. In this connection, he pointed out that the need for inter-village communication was pressing. He suggested the allotment of a special road grant to village panchayets so that, with the help of the road cess and this grant, the panchayets could set about providing inter-village communications.

Mr. Yajaman N. Y. VEERABHADRACHAR seconded the resolution.

Mr. B. L. BYANNA opposed the resolution and said that the mover had not adduced convincing reasons for the abolition of district boards. No doubt, to begin with, it was argued that Government had recently curtailed the powers formerly vested in the district boards and that the little work that was being turned out by the latter was not of benefit to all taluks. Secondly, it was stated that owing to limited knowledge of the requirements of different parts of the district, the district board could not be of real service to all the taluks, but that if the taluk boards were revived, there would be wide-spread improvement and progress. As regards the above contentions, he reminded the House that at a time when the people of Mysore were agitating for the establishment of responsible government, which in effect meant the transfer of power from the Government to elected representatives of the people, it would be a poor compliment to the capacity of non-officials if a non-official member of the House seriously suggested that district boards should be abolished—a step which, if accepted, would result in the surrender of even the little power that was being actually enjoyed by accredited representatives of the people.

Continuing, he recapitulated with regret the appeal made by certain members at the previous session of the House that Government should help the village panchayets in collecting the arrears of panchayet taxes amounting to Rs. 18 lakhs. That appeal implied that the panchayets themselves were not able to collect moneys legitimately due to them But the speaker had reconciled himself to the position on the ground that panchayets were still in an infant stage and that with more experience, they would be able to manage their own affairs without any outside help But he was pained to see that the confession of helplessness on the part of non-officials was repeated in the form of the resolution now before the House.

Proceeding, he argued that if the district boards could not give a better account of themselves, it was solely due to the limited financial resources at their disposal, and he feared that even if taluk boards took the place of district boards the same fate might overtake the taluk boards as well. The remedy for the existing state of affairs lay, in his opinion, not in doing away with the district boards but in augmenting their financial resources and in getting their powers suitably enhanced by negotiation with the Government. He had no objection to anybody urging that taluk boards should be revived, in addition to keeping on the district boards. Personally, he would prefer both the sets of bodies to exist and function.

In this connection, he adverted to a casual remark made by the Second Member of Council in another connection that taluk boards would be superfluous in view of the existence of district boards, as they were not vital to local autonomy so long as there were the village panchayets functioning in the State, and observed that one might as well say that there was no need for the Sub-Division Officers at all in view of the fact that there were Amildars in charge of the various taluks. And just

as Government were anxious to retain both these sets of officers, he said that there was real need for both village panchayets and district boards. But whether taluk boards were revived or not, he strongly felt that it would be a retrograde step to abolish the district boards.

The member concluded with an appeal that even if the initiative came from the Government in this matter, the members should unite in seeing that the district boards were not abolished. On the other hand, by securing the services of the best available men as members of district boards, all concerned should see that these important autonomous bodies were enabled to enjoy larger powers and higher reputation than at present.

Mr. G. MALLANNA, who further opposed the resolution, reminded the House that taluk boards which had been in existence in the State in the past came to be abolished because they lacked the resources with which to undertake any work of importance. He explained that district boards had given a better account of themselves in all the districts. The Mysore District Board, for example, had to its credit four large bridges which had cost them about Rs. 10 lakhs to Rs. 12 lakhs and also the Nanjangud-Chamarajanagar Railway. But for the efforts of the district board, these works would not have been undertaken at all. These two instances alone, he thought, were enough to show what amount of work well-managed district boards could achieve.

He next referred to the contention that the district boards could not be of much help to the villages and said that village panchayets with poor resources and no co-ordination with other local self-governing institutions could achieve still less. While at least the district boards could call themselves self-governing institutions in some real sense, the village panchayets could never hope to be independent of the control of the Revenue Department. It was only when conditions so improved as to result in an amendment of the Acts in force so as to establish some kind of co-ordination between the district boards and the village panchayets that the two sets of bodies could show tangible progress.

Proceeding, he said that one of the objects underlying the constitution of local self-government institutions was that they should serve as a training ground for the elected representatives of the people, so that they might, in course of time, be ready to shoulder larger responsibilities to represent the views and opinions of the tax-payers and to safeguard their interests not only in the constitutional Houses of the State but also in the Federal Assemblies. Abolition of the district boards would have the effect of cutting at the very root of democracy in the State. He regretted that the mover and his supporters had attempted to belittle the work and importance of the district boards and urged that the resolution should not be supported by the House. Abolition of the district boards, he said, would be a retrograde, reactionary and short-sighted policy.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH, on the other hand, supported the resolution. He said that those who were opposed to the abolition of district boards were persons who were hoping to become presidents or vice-presidents of those bodies. From personal experience as a member of both a district board and a school board, he had no hesitation in recommending the total abolition of district boards. While admitting that there was no paucity of competent non-officials in Mysore to work as presidents of district boards, he was of opinion that the expenditure incurred on these organisations was not in the best interests of the rural areas. A lot of money was spent in the shape of travelling allowance to the President for inspecting a few petty repair works executed under the supervision of sanitary inspectors. All important works in the district were being carried out under the supervision of departmental officers and thus the district board as an institution had no responsibility for such works, nor was there anything else which district boards or the members thereof were in a position to do for the

good of the areas included within their jurisdictions.

Referring next to the deliberations of these local bodies, he said that district board meetings were being held once in three or four months and even at such meetings, no work was turned out by these bodies beyond recording the Government orders received and reviewing the work of sanitary inspectors and vaccinators. He deplored that at a time when non-officials in the neighbouring provinces were aspiring for much higher things like responsible government under a democratic federal scheme, non-officials in Mysore were hugging to institutions which were devoid of both power and financial resources.

In conclusion, he said that there would be a definite advantage in reviving the taluk boards to take the place of the district boards and explained that the jurisdiction of the taluk boards being limited, the members thereof could acquire first-hand knowledge of the needs of the villages and attend to them in the order of urgency. There would be closer co-ordination between the activities of village panchayets and taluk boards resulting in the maximum advantage to each taluk and ultimately to the State as a whole.

Lokasevaniratha Bale SIDDALINGA SETTY regretted very much that the previous speaker had sought to make light of the work of non-officials on the district boards and cited several instances in which the Government themselves had conveyed their high appreciation of the services rendered by such members. He also regretted that the previous speaker had lost sight of the fact that non-officials had much to gain from participation in the work of the local bodies if they wished to occupy higher positions. He strongly repudiated the suggestion that non-officials were attracted to local bodies purely on account of the travelling allowances which they might be entitled to draw. He also remarked that it was only those who were unable to get returned as members of the local bodies that thought it fit to make such insinuations against the most deserving people who were elected as members, and to urge for the abolition of the local bodies themselves. The speaker appealed to the members not to support such a retrograde proposal, particularly at the present time when Government were inclined to grant further reforms in favour of the constitutional assemblies of the State.

Mr. GURUBASAPPA pointed out that Mr. Madiah, who on the present occasion argued so vehemently in favour of the abolition of district boards, had expressed the opinion that district boards were doing very good work and, for that reason, had urged at the District Conference that larger powers should be given to them. As such, he considered that no weight need be attached to the opinion of Mr. Madiah who did not seem to have settled views on the question under discussion.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHY ACHAR pointed out that the activities of district boards had to be curtailed mainly on account of want of funds. While the functions assigned to them were numerous, the resources at their disposal were very limited. The Government too were not helping them with liberal grants. If only substantial help was given and the powers of these bodies were also suitably enhanced, he had no doubt that the usefulness of district boards could be appreciated by one and all. But whether such help was given or not, the speaker was not in favour of taluk boards being revived. So far as improvement of the villages was concerned, he said that the panchayets themselves would be able to look after that duty if only they had sufficient funds at their command. But as matters stood, very few of the panchayets were well off and consequently, most of the villages lacked roads, drains, drinking water wells, schools, etc. The member therefore suggested that, rather than reviving the taluk boards, the existing panchayets themselves might be invested with larger powers and that the financial resources now placed at the disposal of district boards be allocated among the panchayets.

Mr. SHER KHAN opposed the resolution. He was himself a member of a

district board for long and could personally testify to the vast amount of good which district boards could do for the people committed to their charge. He had no hesitation in saying that the district board formed a unit of district administration and that it should continue as such in future also. He was not in favour of reviving the taluk boards for the reason that their income was very meagre and they could not undertake any large work of public utility with such income. The district boards, on the other hand, had larger resources and could be expected to undertake larger schemes in addition to attending to a number of routine duties. He added that administration was becoming a highly technical art and the advice of specially trained men was needed in all directions. Such advice would be available at district headquarter towns more than in the taluks and the villages. From this point of view, the district boards were in a better position than smaller units of administration to serve public interests. Besides, the district board also happened to be the local education authority for the entire district, and it stood to reason that it should exercise control in other fields also in all the taluks included in the district.

He concluded by saying that a lot of needless dislocation of public business would be caused if the district boards which had established themselves well and were doing very good work, were abolished and taluk boards which had failed of their purpose in the past, substituted in their places.

Mr. T. SHADAKSHARAPPA was of opinon that district boards were doing very useful work and should therefore be kept on.

Mr. Bhupalam R. CHANDRASEKHARAYYA felt that whether the district boards were kept on or taluk boards were substituted for them, the system of work would continue to be the same as at present, that representatives of the people would have to meet and discuss and decide upon the things to be done; that in either case, the boards would serve as a training ground for non-official workers aspiring for an increasing share in the management of public business; and that it would be a pity to interfere with the working of the existing non-official bodies at a time when further constitutional reforms in the State were in sight. At the same time, he thought that the views and opinions so far expressed on the resolution before the House were so conflicting that it would be difficult readily to arrive at a conclusion on the question. He therefore suggested the appointment of an expert committee to examine the matter in all its aspects, collect opinions in all the districts, and submit suitable recommendations to Government.

Mr. Y. V. KUMARIAH said that from personal knowledge of the attitude of district boards towards the different taluks within their jurisdiction, he had no hesitation in saying that the district boards had not justified their existence. For instance, at the time the Devanhalli Taluk Board was abolished, it had a cash balance of Rs. 22,000 and in spite of it, every proposal relating to improvement of Devanhalli Taluk was being consistently turned down by the district board. Thus, the district boards were not at all interested in the welfare of the interior parts and for that reason, it was desirable to abolish them and revive taluk boards to manage their own affairs.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH said that taluk boards were in existence in the State at a time when there were no village panchayets. After the Village Panchayet Act was passed and came into effect, taluks boards became unnecessary and were therefore abolished. If they were now to be revived, the district boards would have no work to do. The question, if at all, was whether there should be taluk boards only or district boards only. Taluk boards having proved a failure already, it was well that sufficient chances were given for district boards to show good work.

Speaking for himself, he thought that there were both advantages and disadvantages in continuing the district boards with their limited powers and resources. Still, if the advantages outweighed the disadvantages, he said it would be worth while to continue them. Referring incidentally to the

credit claimed by the Mysore District Board for having constructed 4 major bridges, he pointed out that what that district board had actually done was to take away the moneys collected from various parts of the district and spend them for the benefit of particular areas—much to the neglect of the other parts of the district. In such cases, he observed that a legitimate grievance on the part of particular parts of the district against the district board as a whole, would be inevitable.

As regards the suggestion of Mr. G Mallanna that there should be some kind of co-ordination between the village panchayets and the district boards, he said that that would amount to giving the district boards a direct hold on the finances of the panchayets. Such an arrangement, he feared, would interfere with the independence of the panchayets. The village panchayets, he emphasized, should continue to be as independent as the municipalities and no scope should be created in favour of any other non-official organization to exercise control over them. In this view, he was definitely opposed to the establishment of any kind of co-ordination between village panchayets and district boards.

At the same time, he said it was necessary to take the spirit of the times into account and consider whether the non-officials need surrender away even the meagre powers and privileges granted to them by Government under the existing scheme of local self-government. It must be recognised that, but for the financial limitations imposed on them, the district boards might have shown a much better record of work. But it was likely that the existing low economic condition of the tax-payer might not continue for long. Bearing this in mind, he said it would not be a wise step to ask for the abolition of the district boards. There would be no special advantage to be gained by substituting taluk boards. It was best that district boards were continued, and for this reason, the member opposed the resolution.

Mr. KAPINIAH GOWDA was of opinion that district boards ought not to be abolished.

Mr. GURUSWAMI GOWDA, on the other hand, pointed out that the District Board of Bangalore was not even caring to repair the roads which had been laid out by the Taluk Board of Hoskote. He thought that district boards might well be abolished and taluk boards revived to take their place.

The resolution was, at this stage, put to vote and declared lost, 52 members voting for and 60 against.

DEWAN'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Mr. C. K. VENKATARAMIAH, Kannada Translator to Government, read the Kannada version of the Dewan's Concluding Remarks, as follows :—

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

Let me first offer you my sincere thanks for the very friendly and helpful spirit in which you have all discussed the many subjects that came before us at this session. That was only in keeping with the best traditions of the House. It is an unquestionable fact that this Assembly is a most useful, as it is a unique, political institution. That it may continue to flourish and render greater and greater service to the State, its Ruler and its people is my fervent wish.

We have got through more than the usual amount of work at this session.

Bills.

All the eleven bills placed before the House have been fully discussed and their general principles approved. We are obliged to you for your suggestions in regard to various matters, and I may assure you that Government will carry out as many of them as possible within the limits of their resources.

Budget.

The budget shows an increase of Rs. 5·16 lakhs under "Land Revenue," as compared with the revised estimate for the current year. This increase

does not indicate, as some members seemed to fear, any new demand in contemplation, or any reversal of the policy of collecting revenue in a considerate manner wherever necessary. The budget figure is framed in the expectation of favourable seasonal conditions next year. Considering the actual collection in fairly good years in the past, the estimate of receipts under "Land Revenue" cannot be said to be excessive. Besides, it has to be remembered that the amount to be collected next year will include heavy arrears as well as demands on account of the expansion of irrigation. It is expected that during next year an additional extent of 15,000 acres (10,000 under the Irwin Canal and 5,000 under other new irrigation works) will be brought under irrigation.

Remissions.

As you are doubtless aware, the assessment on certain dry lands in the Districts of Bangalore, Kolar, Hassan, Kadur and Shimoga has been permanently reduced by Rs. 1,53,538, and that on gardens in the Shimoga and Kadur Districts by Rs. 28,698. Owing to unfavourable seasonal conditions, remission of wet assessment aggregating Rs. 3 lakhs was sanctioned, and notice and forfeiture fees amounting to Rs. 41,678 were written off in 1937-38. The seasonal remissions during the current year already amount to Rs. 1,75,000, and when the proposals for further remissions have been dealt with, the figure may not fall short of Rs. 3 lakhs. I can assure you that the policy underlying these concessions, to the liberality of which some of the members have borne testimony, will be fully maintained in the coming year, should the seasonal conditions unfortunately prove to be adverse in any part of the State.

Bangalore City Drainage Works.

The members representing Bangalore City made a vigorous plea for a special grant for the drainage works which the Municipality has undertaken. The drainage scheme is estimated to cost Rs. 50 lakhs or more. It is quite true that Government promised a substantial sum (Rs. 10 lakhs, if I am not mistaken) as their contribution towards the cost of the scheme. It is proposed to pay a sum of Rs. 50,000 to the Municipality next year to enable it to make better progress with the work, which is not going on as rapidly as one might wish.

In view of the keen desire expressed by many members, an additional sum of Rs. 10,000 will be provided for village and town improvements.

Primary Education.

During the discussion on the budget several members alluded to the provision made for elementary education. For many years past Government have been providing sums ranging between Rs. 10,000 and Rs. 15,000 a year for the expansion of primary education. Although they have thus shown their willingness to bear their share of the cost of expansion, few local education authorities have found it possible to give their quota. The Elementary Education Act has been in force for eight years now, but the high hopes entertained at the time of its introduction have not been quite realised. Government, therefore, appointed a Committee to enquire into the working of the Elementary Education Act. This Committee has already published an *ad interim* report, and its final report may shortly be expected. Whatever may be the ultimate conclusion arrived at after the report of the Committee has been considered, it is obvious that increased expenditure from the general revenues of Government or the revenues of the local authorities will be necessary for the further expansion of elementary education. In view of the fact that the whole question of the future administration and financing of elementary education will very shortly be reviewed, Government have not considered it desirable to make any very large increase in the normal provision for elementary education in the budget. They have,

however, provided a sum of Rs. 10,000 for normal expansion.

The grant to the Boy Scout Movement has been increased by roughly 50 per cent. This additional sum will enable a forward movement to be undertaken in this most urgent and necessary work.

Middle School Education.

Government have in the past three years sanctioned 159 additional teachers for middle schools. The provision for these extra teachers has not only been continued, but an extra sum of Rs. 10,000 has also been allotted for more teachers. A sum of Rs 8,000 has been provided to open five new middle schools, and an additional sum of Rs. 5,000 has been given for the equipment of these schools.

In my speech at the Dasara session of this Assembly I alluded to the possibility that the time might come when it would no longer be possible to continue to make middle school education free throughout the State. Nowhere else in India is this so, and the increasing demand for more middle schools makes the question more urgent than ever. Although five new schools have been sanctioned this year, and a slightly greater number was sanctioned in each of the last few years, we are nowhere near satisfying the demand. There are at the moment applications pending in the Department for fresh middle schools in something like seventy centres, none of which can, for financial reasons, be sanctioned at present. The question can be solved, as far as one can see, only by the reimposition of fees. In order to obviate hardship to poor students, a generous provision by way of freeships up to 35 or even 40 per cent of the total strength can be provided. Government would continue to give not less than the same amount of money, under all heads, for middle schools as was being given before fees were reintroduced. The total fee income could be funded and used for such urgent building and equipment needs as cannot be met from the normal budget allotments. This is one line of action that seems possible and desirable. The matter is, however, being considered by Government in all its aspects.

Medical Relief.

The Medical budget for next year provides for an expenditure of Rs. 1,57,000 in excess of the current year's budget. While additional grants to the extent of Rs. 50,400 have been made to the central institutions in Bangalore and Mysore, like the Victoria and Krishnarajendra hospitals, the district hospitals and the local fund dispensaries have also received much more attention than before, the provision for district hospitals being increased by Rs. 24,250 and that for the local fund dispensaries by Rs. 32,400, inclusive of a provision of Rs. 10,000 for opening new dispensaries. One important feature of the budget is the special provision of Rs. 15,000 made for additional nursing and other staff for the hospitals. A special provision of Rs. 1,00,000 has also been made for equipping the district hospitals and other institutions with surgical instruments and other equipment.

A sum of Rs. 1,86,000 has also been provided in the Public Works budget for the construction of medical buildings, chief among which may be mentioned the following :—

	Rs.
Local Fund Dispensaries	10,000
Improvements to Princess Krishnajammanni Tuberculosis Sanatorium	56,000
Two special wards to Krishnarajendra Hospital ...	12,000
Pathological block in the Krishnarajendra Hospital ...	15,000
Extension to Chamarajendra Hospital, Hassan ...	36,000
New hospital for Mandya	23,000
Improvements to Narasimharaja Hospital	10,000

"Tupra" Leaves.

A representation was made that the leasing of the right to collect "tupra" leaves may be abolished, in view of the great hardship which is being caused to the small *beedi* manufacturer. Even now people are allowed to remove them free in head-loads, but Government have decided to abolish the system of farming altogether and to allow their free removal. Necessary precautions will have to be taken to ensure that the leaves are removed for *bona fide* use within the State and not sold at a profit by middlemen.

Agricultural Improvements.

It is a matter for gratification that the *raiyats* are showing keen appreciation of the work of the Agricultural Department and are co-operating with it in increasing measure. The practical demonstration section of the Department has been largely developed. The number of circle officers was raised last year from 4 to 9 so as to provide one officer for each district, and the number of range inspectors was also increased from 35 to 43. Thousands of plots have been laid out in *raiyats'* fields to demonstrate the advantages of using improved seed, better manuring and better cultural methods. The scheme, which was started from the Rural Development Fund, has now been made a regular feature of the work of the Department. Government have provided a sum of Rs. 10,000 in the budget to meet the cost of the free supply of improved seed for demonstration plots in *raiyats'* fields.

Tractors will be used to demonstrate power farming, to assist large landholders to bring fallow land under cultivation, and to enable village *panchayets* to improve the village *gomal* by the cultivation of land with dry Napier grass. Arrangements have been made to supply large quantities of seedlings of Napier grass, and nearly 500 lbs. of seed are reported to have been distributed.

The use of activated carbon, prepared by an improved process by the chemists of the Department, has been found to be very useful for preparing cream jaggery and *bura* sugar. A scheme has been sanctioned at a cost of Rs. 21,300 for the preparation of large quantities of the carbon to meet the demand. A special officer is to be appointed shortly to improve and develop paddy cultivation in the *malnad*.

Liberal additional allotments have been sanctioned for the equipment and supply of medicines to veterinary hospitals. A new cattle farm at Hunsur for five hundred head of cattle has been sanctioned to increase the supply of stud bulls and bull calves to the *raiyats*. Five poultry farms at district headquarters will be started next year. The hatcheries in the Hebbal Farm have been expanded to meet the increasing demand for eggs and chickens. It will thus be seen that every effort is being made to render all possible help to the *raiyats*. The Department has been given additional funds to the extent of about Rs. 74.000,

In the course of the discussions, a representation was made that the facilities at present offered by Government for the installation of irrigation pumps under the hire-purchase system should be extended and liberalised. Under the existing rules, 50 per cent of the cost of installation has to be paid by the consumer before the work is started, and the balance is payable in two equal annual instalments. The rate of interest, which was 6 per cent, was reduced to 5 per cent., two years ago. In order that the pumps may be more largely used, the rate of interest will be further reduced to 4 per cent., per annum, and discretion will be given to the Chief Electrical Engineer to extend the period of repayment up to a maximum of five years in suitable cases.

Electrification of Srinivasapur.

The representatives of Srinivasapur town and taluk will be happy to hear that, in addition to the towns mentioned in my address, it has since been decided to sanction the electrification of their town, and I hope that the work will be taken up and completed soon.

Provincial and District Board Roads.

I am glad to tell you that henceforth the provincial and the district board roads passing through towns and villages will be maintained by the Public Works Department. No contribution will be levied from the municipalities or the district boards for their maintenance. I hope that it will not be long before all these roads are tarred and rendered dust-free.

Inter-village Roads.

With regard to the improvement of village communications, it is, I hope, superfluous for me to assure you that Government entirely sympathise with your desire that every effort should be made, in the interest of the countryside, to form and maintain inter-village roads in a satisfactory condition. Let it be our ambition to make every village in the State easily accessible to the motorist. I promise you the fullest co-operation and support of Government in realising that ambition as early as possible.

Railway Workshop

As a result of the discussion on the labour situation in the Railway Workshop at Mysore, the members of the House, including the mover of the subject, were convinced that the Railway authorities had tried their best to devise suitable machinery for ascertaining the wants, and. where possible, remedying the grievances of the workers, and that their insistence on their alleged right to form a union was, in the circumstances, unjustified. Most of the important industrial undertakings in the State are either owned or controlled by Government, who are as solicitous about the welfare of the workers as they are of other classes of public servants. As the majority of the speakers agreed, there is no need at present in the State for any trade union legislation. Government certainly have no intention of introducing such legislation now or in the near future, and if the workers in the Railway are wise, they will avail themselves of the opportunities for periodical consultation now offered to them by the Management. Nothing but disappointment and suffering can come to them, if they allow themselves to be beguiled by professional agitators. And, let me emphasise, the last thing we wish to do is to allow outsiders to meddle in our affairs.

I now declare the session closed.

Vote of Thanks.

MR. D. VENKATARAMANAPPA conveyed to the President and the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly the sincere thanks of the House for the patient hearing given to the members during this long session and for the very sympathetic replies given to them both during the discussions and in the concluding remarks of the President He also prayed that the renewed assurances of loyalty of the House be submitted to His Highness the Maharaja.

With three cheers to His Highness the Maharaja and to the President of the Assembly, the House adjourned at 12-15 P.M. *sine die.*

BANGALORE,
Dated 15th September 1939.

C SUBRAHMANYA AIYAR,
Secretary, Mysore Representative Assembly.

R.A.